

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1272

THOMAS F. BOWLING,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF LYNCHBURG; SUSAN L. HARTMAN; MONICA CHAVIS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at
Lynchburg. Norman K. Moon, Senior District Judge. (6:25-cv-00042-NKM)

Submitted: July 23, 2026

Decided: July 28, 2026

Before WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Franklin Bowling, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Franklin Bowling seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and a subsequent order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

In a civil case, a party must file a notice of appeal within 30 days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). *See Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007) (“[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement.”).

The district court entered its dismissal on August 8, 2025. Bowling filed the notice of appeal on March 6, 2026. Because Bowling failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period,^{*} we dismiss the appeal as to the dismissal order.

Regarding the district court's denial of Bowling's Rule 60(b) motion, from which Bowling timely appealed, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Bowling v. City of Lynchburg*, No. 6:25-cv-00042-NKM (W.D. Va. Feb. 5, 2026). We dispense with oral argument because the

^{*} Bowling's Rule 60(b) motion did not toll the appeal period because it was not filed within 28 days of the entry of the underlying dismissal order. *See* Fed R. App. P. 4(a)(4).

facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*